


LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
  
0 021 547 904 3

Hollinger Corp.  
pH 8.5

11525  
07

The Greatest "HIT" in War Literature

---

D 525  
.07  
Copy 1

THE  
C A T E C H I S M  
OF  
BALAAM, JR.

BY  
AN IRISH-AMERICAN

*O'Shual, S. J.*  
"                     

SIXTH EDITION

1915

---

120,000 copies of this pamphlet have now been circulated  
Sixty thousand copies have been printed, mailed and distributed  
at my own personal expense for the good of the cause, but  
I now find the demand for this pamphlet so great that  
I am obliged to ask the cost price of same from  
those who desire large quantities and wish  
to help me in this work, namely:

ONE CENT PER COPY

Small quantities will be gladly sent gratis, as heretofore  
upon application to

HUGH H. MASTERSON

170 CHAMBERS ST.

NEW YORK

Copyright 1915 by  
Hugh H. Masterson, 170 Chambers St., New York

---

After reading same, please p-

## AUTHORSHIP AND AUTHORITIES.

The author of this pamphlet must remain anonymous till the end of the War. At that time anyone can learn his name from the publisher.

Author and publisher vouch that every statement herein can be verified. It is impossible at any one moment to have every source and authority at hand. The following references cover much of the ground.

As to details of German history and political, social and cultural conditions, see any public library catalog. For a deep study read Chamberlain's "Foundations of the 19th Century."

**On the Kaiser's Powers:** Read the German Constitution.

**Who Struck First?** Read the American newspapers up to Aug. 1st, 1914; White Papers, published by N. Y. Times; Count Von Bernstorff in N. Y. Times Aug. 30; letters in N. Y. Times Sept. 13; letter from German officer, Washington Star, Sept. 6; letter in N. Y. Times Aug. 30, headed "Russia's Early War Moves," quoting Russian papers; Dr. Dernburg in N. Y. Sun Oct. 11; Kaiser's speech reported in papers Aug. 4 and 5; German statement of French aggression, Washington Post, Aug. 4; many articles in Fatherland and Gaelic American.

**On Alsace-Lorraine:** Read history of Louis XIV and Napoleon, and Munsterberg's "The War and America."

**On Serbia:** Report of Carnegie International Commission to Investigate the Balkan Wars; Alex. Konta in N. Y. Tribune Aug. 9; Dr. Geo. Bartelme, Washington Post Aug. 12; article by Father Schwertner in Rosary Magazine for August; Emily G. Hutchings in Reedy's Mirror (St. Louis) Aug. 14.

**Pan-Slavism:** The Fatherland; article by Austrian Diplomatist, N. Y. Sun Oct. 11.

**Belgian Neutrality:** Article by Prof. Burgess in Vital Issue; articles in Fatherland; quotation from English army officer's letter in Gaelic American, August 29; German official statements in all American papers.

**England's Attitude:** The Gaelic American (165 William St., N. Y.) the White Papers; Prof. Sloane, N. Y. Times Sept. 20; Count Von Bernstorff, N. Y. Times Aug. 30; Dr. Dernburg, N. Y. Sun Oct. 11; Wm. Dayard Hale, N. Y. Journal Sept. 16; German Chancellor, Washington Times of Sept. 23; letter in London Nation Aug. 15 (N. Y. Sun Oct. 11); letter of Shaemas O'Sheel, Washington Times Aug. 8; B. L. Frazier, Washington Post Aug. 18; Kuno Franke, N. Y. Times Aug. 23; The War and America by Munsterberg; letter by F. C. T. Krueger, N. Y. Evening Post, Aug. 5; Emily G. Hutchings, Reedy's Mirror, Aug. 14; statements of Kier Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald reported in English and American papers; England's joy over destruction of German commerce and determination to crush Germany, reported in N. Y. Times Aug. 16, Washington Post Sept. 1 and 16; Washington Times Sept. 12, 14, 28. English and Irish history.

**American and other refutation of German atrocity tales, Belgian and Russian atrocities, French and English use of dum-dums, Louvain:** N. Y. Sun Sept. 5, 17; N. Y. Times Aug. 16, 23, 30; Sept. 6, 20, 27; Oct. 11; N. Y. World Sept. 1, 16; Oct. 9, 10; Washington Post Aug. 19, 21, 26, 29; Sept. 2, 7, 8, 11, 14, 19; Washington Star Sept. 5, 18; Oct. 12; Washington Times Aug. 15, 16, 28, 29; Sept. 20, 23; Oct. 14; The Vital Issue Sept. 21; Statement of Lord Roberts, The Independent, Oct. 10.

**Civilian Snipers and Non-combatants in Cities within war area:** Read history of American occupation of Vera Cruz, and any book on international military law. Note totally unproved nature of charges, even those of French and Belgian governments.

**Turcos and Senegalese:** Reading notices and pictures in all papers; Washington Post Sept. 16; Washington Times Sept. 12, and especially Post Oct. 17, American physician's personal experience of

JAN 25 1915

THE CATECHISM  
OF  
BALAAM, JR.

---

It will be remembered that the prophet Balaam rode an ass which persisted in testifying to the Truth while Balaam was doing his best in behalf of the Lie. Let us imagine a modern Balaam and his ass answering, with more or less irregular alternation, certain questions about the present War. The reader is left to guess which answers are given by the recreant prophet and which by the ass inspired by God.

Question: Who started this War?

Answer: The Kaiser.

Q. How do we know that?

A. Well, everyone knows he is the War Lord!

Q. How did he get that title?

A. By some Englishman's deliberate mis-translation of the title "Kriegsherr," which is merely the same as any constitutional ruler's title of "Commander-in-Chief."

Q. But is there no other proof that the Kaiser is a War-Lord?

A. Oh yes, his record shows it.

Q. What is his record?

A. For twenty-five years he has ruled a nation armed and able to crush any enemy individually; but he has never struck. He has carried on the policy of his predecessors to the result that peace has reigned in Central Europe for forty-three years, a longer period than ever before since the breaking of the Pax Romana. During that time Germany has given the world a cherished example of human capabilities in all the ways of Peace—in the arts, science, scholarship, philosophy, local government, efficient state—socialism, manufactures, commerce, personal freedom, personal intelligence, personal health and capacity.

Q. We must inevitably conclude, then, must we not, that the ruler of a nation so busy with continual triumphs of Peace would naturally plunge his nation into a wanton and unnecessary war?

A. Oh, inevitably.

Q. What corroboration is there for this view?

A. The fact that he has kept the peace so long, while a war of triumph would have been what we call a "cinch;" the fact that if he started this war, he started it when the odds against him almost shut out the possible vision of success; the fact, finally, that individually he has no power at all to throw his enlightened, critical, independent and stubborn people into war.

Q. But he has vast power, has he not?

A. Oh yes, slightly less than the President of the United States.

Q. How else do we know that the Kaiser started the war?

A. Why, everyone knows he wants to rule all Europe, and then grab America and the rest of the world.

Q. Has he, or any one for him, ever said so or hinted so?

A. No, but the newspapers and Winston Churchill tell us so.

Q. It seems very plausible, doesn't it?

A. Decidedly—a nation of some 60,000,000 people, hemmed in the center of Europe, would have, as any one can see, what American slang calls "a healthy chance" to conquer the world.

Q. How else do we know that the Kaiser started the war?

A. Well, he begged the Czar to refrain from mobilizing, and assured him (having taken the trouble to get the assurance from Austria) that Austria would not seize any of the territory of Serbia. He assured the English that if they remained neutral, he would not use his navy in a way to threaten the north coast of France or do anything that England could consider dangerous to her interests. Furthermore, we know that the Kaiser started the war because the Czar began to threaten Germany with his barbarous millions, and because French aviators sailed over Germany and dropped bombs into Coblenz and Nuremberg before war was declared, and because the French Minister Delcasse, whose occupation is making war on Germany, had gone to St. Petersburg—beg pardon, Petrograd—months ago to discuss joint action against Germany, and because three or four years ago Gen. Joffre was made commander-in-chief of the French armies with the unconcealed purpose of leading them against Germany, and because France recently made a loan to Russia which was used



for the sole purpose of building railroads to the borders of Prussia—railroads of no use except to convey troops. We know that the Kaiser started the war, finally, because France has spent forty-three years of unintermittent brooding on the re-capture of Alsace-Lorraine and on Revenge.

Q. France deserves the sympathy of the world in her ambition to re-capture Alsace-Lorraine, does she not?

A. Oh, yes!

Q. Tell us just why.

A. Well, a couple of hundred years ago her King Louis XIV., the most heartless, ambitious and absolute conqueror since Attila, tore these provinces, amid flame and murder, from the bleeding side of Germany. The people are all German in blood to this day. For many years after Louis stole them, they cherished hatred of France and the French. Gradually they became resigned and peaceful, but neither honored nor respected by the French, nor prosperous, nor enthusiastically Gallic. When Germany had beaten France in 1870 after a most valiant defence, Elsass-Lothringen (their real names) were taken by Germany, both as a most obvious military necessity and as a just recovery of stolen property.

Q. But the people have suffered terribly, have they not?

A. Oh, of course; they have been given a constitution, large autonomy, an honorable place in the concert of German states, liberal laws, peace and unprecedented prosperity. Under this shocking treatment they have become so reconciled to their German kindred that in spite of forty years of French intrigue, they are now being shot by the French for helping their German defenders and deceiving the French invaders.

Q. But wasn't there a terrible incident at Zabern?

A. Oh, frightful! An old cobbler, drunk with the impudence of French intrigue, insulted the army till a young lieutenant lost his temper and hit him with his sword. In the subsequent rioting the government acted with great restraint, and removed the offending troops. All this was horrible to the French, who, two years ago at Casabianca, turned the stomachs of strong Spanish soldiers by their unmentionable atrocities on the Moors; and to the English, who, on July 26th of this year, first ran away from a body of Irish volunteers with clubbed rifles, and later killed three and wounded sixty citizens, chiefly women and children, in Dublin, and to the Russians, whose record is too resplendent to need illumination here.

Q. Was there any other cause for this war?

A. Oh yes, Austria's bullying attack on Servia.

Q. This was quite unwarranted, was it not?

A. Quite. The Servians are a sort of innocent child-like people, very much like Johnny, who

——“pushed Grandmother into the lake,

Just to see how big a splash she would make,”  
or like Jimmy, who

—————“whimsically  
Jabbed a knife in sister Sally.”

They delight in assassinations, whenever they can get the expenses paid by Russia, and they maintain societies for the study of this sport, and for the purpose of drawing down the kopecks from Russia. Just as the German government fosters athletics, the Servian authorities encourage their child-like citizens in this gentle exercise of assassination, turning out large batches of bombs in the royal arsenal at Kragojevatz. Having a natural antipathy to civilization, they look upon it as a duty, not to say pleasure, to intrigue by all methods including the bomb and pistol for the break-up and destruction of Austria-Hungary. Their conduct in this respect has been no worse than if the Mexicans, paid and encouraged by Brazil, Chili and the Argentine, should amuse themselves by practicing their well-known sports in the border states of our country; and the Servian assassination of the Archduke and his wife was quite like a Mexican assassination of our Vice-President and his wife. Every one knows that we would make no fuss about little things of that sort. So, if Mexicans were constantly stirring up revolt in Texas and California, which we rescued from Mexican barbarism, they would be doing only what the Servians have done in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which Austria protected from the Turk, and raised to prosperity and peace.

Q. It is highly credible, is it not, that the Servian government and people would have united in assassination and defiance without any assurance from Russia that Russia would back them up?

A. Oh, highly credible!

Q. Russia is unselfishly interested in the establishment of a great South Slav Empire, is she not?

A. Undoubtedly. Every fact known to us, and every line of reasoning prove it. For instance, Russia for long years has



encouraged Pan-Slavism, which means the union of all Slavs under the Czar and the Procurator of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church. This proves that she desired the erection of a strong, proud, independent rival Slav state. Then, again, Russia's ambition of ambitions is to possess Constantinople, and as a great South Slav Empire would forever bar her from that, it is quite clear that she is fostering a great South Slav Empire.

Q. Let us change the subject again. Mention another cause of the war.

A. Why, Germany's violation of the neutrality of Belgium!

Q. This aroused horror in the breasts of Englishmen and Frenchmen, did it not?

A. Assuredly. It was outrageous. Why, nearly two years ago England had ordered her troops in Ireland to be ready to sail for Antwerp to strike at Germany. Thirty motor-cars full of French officers rushed into Belgium before war started. French soldiers were in the forts at Liege and Namur. The forts of Belgium were directed as defences against Germany only. Events have shown that the English plan hinged on landing troops, not in France, but in Belgium, and the French tactics have shown that they expected to have their whole force free to strike at Alsace-Lorraine, by reason of the English and Belgians holding their northwestern frontier. Oh yes, the German violation of Belgian neutrality was dreadful.

Q. But Germany, instead of being impolite enough to strike first when she found her neighbors reaching for their hip-pockets, should have calmly waited till the French were before Strassburg, the Belgians and English threatening Aachen and Cologne, the Russians operating from Danzig against Berlin, should she not?

A. Yes. Every Frenchman, Briton and Russian thinks so.

Q. What is England's attitude toward this war?

A. Goodness me, she is dreadfully opposed to it, you know. Oh dear me, yes!

Q. How do we know that?

A. Well, when the first really great German ocean-liner was launched, the leading English newspaper said: "Germany must be destroyed." It is notorious that Germans have been deftly taking the world's markets away from the English, wherever they compete, which is a beastly thing, y'know, especially when the beggars do it by being more thoro, working harder, using more brains and less haughtiness, more business skill and friendliness

and less rum, bibles and "expeditionary forces." The best unbiased writers say that this is the cause of the war; reason confirms it; the gloating of the English day by day, as reports of the capture and sinking of German ships come in, makes it sure. Furthermore, as a political corollary of her mercantile policy, England has always destroyed her greatest rival, deliberately and ruthlessly. She destroyed Spain by the aid of pirates and fortunate hurricanes; Napoleonic France by inciting the rest of Europe against Napoleon; Russia by the aid of Turkey and Japan. Now it is Germany's turn.

Q. But England is fighting for Liberty, Progress, Enlightenment, Democracy, Altruism, and all that sort of thing, you know, isn't she?

A. Oh, certainly. To be sure. She always fights for them. You'd think she'd achieve them sometime!

Q. What example have we of British freedom, etc., etc.?

A. Well, there's Ireland. Superior civilization gradually worn down by seven centuries of murder, pillage, arson, bribery, poisoning; culture rooted out by imposition of alien language, laws, education, dress, customs, etc., under penalty of death (culture recently revived, thanks to German scholars); population cut in half by famine while English soldiers took plentiful crops out of the land; manufactures ruined by laws forbidding them in so many words; Constitution ravished by bribery and force; politicians corrupted; tyranny continuing to-day as much as ever, a bit under cover. Then there is India. Occupied by fooling the Indians and kicking out the dearly-beloved French. Order restored by means of rifles, taxation, the ruin of industry, famines (countless millions dying under English rule in vast excess over numbers dying from like causes in many centuries preceding). And Egypt. Occupied under solemn pledge to get out again almost immediately. Hands of the clock stopped somehow, so the Briton finds himself compelled to stay and gather great wealth, not to mention being so very convenient to Suez, by which means he can instantly threaten and injure the commerce not only of Germany, but of dear France and Russia too. Frequent hangings of Egyptians helps to relieve the bore of it all. Farther down, South Africa. Conquered by the unflinching British heroism which kept right on despite the sneers of the world which saw its vast armies routed by about 30,000 active cavalymen—sharpshooters; finally pacified by concentration of Boer women and children in camps where, according to British admission, 14,000 died of starvation and dis-

ease; according to Boer and Irish accounts, over 20,000; whichever way you look at it, undeniably one of the finest triumphs of English altruism. Or Scotland, a brave, foolish people duped into a loyalty which is costing them their nationality, land and language, as they go over-seas by the scores of thousands yearly, leaving their native hills to the grouse who are grown to be shot (sometimes) by the spindling scions of the pill-and-puffery "nobility." Or anywhere that English capital goes, as in the Putamayo district of Peru, where the Peruvian employees of English directors were quite unmolested by said directors in their system of driving each Indian captive to the limit till in a few months death was certain, with lashing, maiming, etc., all along the way, regardless of sex or age, till an Irishmen exposed this hell to the world. Or take England herself. Square mile after square mile of slums which represent the intensest and most continuous misery, the utmost degradation, the most appalling failure of civilization, to be found anywhere. Rural population disappearing, health and strength ditto. Remaining rural population divided between landlords who live on the rest, farmers whose political minds have been ossified into snobbish toryism for centuries, and laborers who dare not raise a voice in public affairs. A tory party of Bourbon folly, a "Liberal" party existing for the big manufacturers and ruled by the Rothschilds, Sassoons and Samuelsons thru secret party funds. Nowhere else, indeed, as they boast, does liberty flourish as in England and her possessions, thank God!

Q. But these Germans, who are they?

A. Oh, "hordes;" "brutal legions;" "murderers;" "mobs;" "barbarians."

Q. How do we know this?

A. Well, they are the parent stock from which all modern civilization has grown. Their blood and brains saved the decaying Roman world in the time of the "Chaos of Nations." They made Spain when Spain was great, France when France was great, Lombardy and Tuscany in the Renaissance, and England herself. They built a new, distinct, solid civilization in the north of Europe. They drew out of themselves all the qualities that mankind has yet shown itself capable of; they took unto themselves all the qualities of past ages that were useful and aspirational. They steadied the Church. They excelled in early manufactures and honest craftsmanship. They achieved real freedom in their splendid cities. They founded universities, and produced scholars. They have given the world some of its great-

est philosophers, poets and dramatists. Since they achieved national unity, so great has become their pre-eminence in science and education that all the world is under their tutelage in these branches of human study and endeavor. They have contributed very many millions of immigrants to the United States, and their blood is now in the veins of all but a majority of Americans. To look at their history, to regard their institutions, to study their books or attend their universities, to meet them in their own land, and witness their peace, prosperity, geniality, good living, love for the arts and reverence for scholarship; to attend their operas, to meet them in business in America, to send your children to school with their children, to see their affectionate home-life, to do your banking with them, to buy your beer, ice-cream, candies, groceries and delicatessen from them—why, you'd think they were a civilized, splendid people. But not so! The English tell us, and the American press echoes, of course, that they are a horde of barbarians, single-minded on putting out the light of the world.

Q. There is a lot of proof, of course, of the charges against them?

A. Oh, a lot! Thousands of newspapers say it is true. Boys in their 'teens make affidavits. Lots of people know other people who have heard from other people that they know other people who have seen these atrocities. The very fact that every story of cruelty, which an inimical scribbler could find in his memory or in histories of savage times and climes, has been brought forward, should prove the veracity of the charges. Aren't stories of old men being hung up by their thumbs with slow fires under their feet, and children having their hands cut off, and women being brutally and quite needlessly separated from their babes—aren't these classics? So, of course, the German soldiers, who are the same sort of people whom you meet by the hundreds, your German-American fellow citizens—of course they have committed these classic atrocities. The papers say so. If you want further proof, there is the affidavit of five eminent American newspaper men, that no such atrocities could be verified by them on the actual scenes. There is the testimony of hundreds of returning Americans, Mrs. Benjamin Harrison, college professors and presidents, and such like, to the restraint and company of the German army. There are the specific refutations of specific stories which have appeared in even our anti-German papers. There are the repeated and official German denials. There are inherent probabilities and common-sense, if they count. There are the records of the different races—the



records of Walloons and French, English and Russians, to put against the records of Germans. There are even the warnings of Englishmen like Lord Roberts, Lord Gladstone, Lord Selbourne and Jerome K. Jerome, that German atrocity tales are probably false and fictitious.

Q. The Germans use dum-dum bullets and the Allies do not, isn't that it?

A. To be sure. The reports of the Allies speak of the exceptionally clean, small holes made by German bullets, and therefore charge that they are expansive missiles. The Germans, on the other hand, have no proofs except the capture of large quantities of dum-dums from the very persons and bodies of the Allied troops, and the sight of such wounds as an American newspaper-man has described as being made by hunting bullets, such as would be used against savage beasts.

Q. It is barbarous for the Germans to strew mines in the open sea, is it not?

A. Oh, very. Of course, it counts nothing that the Germans officially deny that they have done any such thing. The English fishing fleet sailed all over the North Sea for weeks without striking a mine, so they must have been there. On the other hand, the story that German warships had captured fifteen fishing vessels is obviously untrue; the mines must have risen up out of the sea and towed those fishing boats to Germany. Of course, if those two English cruisers, which first were sunk, had been sunk by submarines or torpedoes, England could not whimper and squeal to the world about German barbarities; so, while her fishing fleet is captured by war ships, her cruisers must be blown up by mines! When German naval victories became too frequent, however, the English had to abandon the pretence, and admit that three cruisers were destroyed by one submarine.

Q. What is to be said about the German use of Zeppelins?

A. It is a foul crime.

Q. Why?

A. Because the other nations have no Zeppelins!

Q. Any other reason?

A. Yes. Non-combatants who stay in fortified cities within the area of war must wish to be killed; and if they protest against being killed by bombs from the sky, it is obvious that they have a preference for death by the Krupp method. Now it is certainly monstrous for the Germans to deny these poor people's last wishes!

Q. When troops have won a difficult victory in fair fight with enemy troops, and when they thereupon occupy a city; and when the non-combatant citizens thereupon begin to "snipe" them from windows, roofs, cellars, corners and every convenient skulking-place; in view of the fact that international law and the rule of civilized warfare permit the drastic punishment of such towns and such people; what should the invading army do?

A. Well, if they happen to be French, English, Russian, Belgian, Servian, or any of that sort, and if we could conceive of any of these capturing a German town, and of German citizens doing any sniping, the conquerors should, of course, punish the German barbarians by indiscriminate shooting, looting and burning. But if it happens that Germans capture an enemy's town, they should, of course, stand around happily, and permit the inhabitants to use them as targets. They should, doubtless, stand as still as possible so as to facilitate good aim. They might even line up in long rows to facilitate the use of mitrail-leuses by these very progressive snipers. We understand that Lord Cowdray and Sir Lionel Carden were very indignant that the American marines did not act thus at Vera Cruz, and doubtless they will share in the English regret that the Germans did not act thus at Louvain. Instead the Germans,, carefully protecting the Cathedral and Town Hall and great pictures, burned one-fifth of the city, putting an end to sniping and avoiding much future bloodshed.

Q. What is the crowning crime of the Germans?

A. That they have been winning.

Q. But there have been many French and English successes, have they not?

A. Not exactly. There have been some Nigger-Moor-Arab successes, and some Hindu-Tartar successes, but we cannot recall any successes by English or French troops with the exception of their strategic retreats. Whatever successes have been achieved under the tri-color of La France along the Alsace-Lorraine border must be attributed to the African savages who have been brought there by the French, since the French reports themselves give these "dashing Turkos," etc., the credit. The attack, which, since the early days of September, is threatening the German's right flank, is being delivered chiefly by Sepoys, Ghurkas, Sikhs, and other pleasant denizens of India, by Russians, and by the same Turkos and Senegalese, who, according to American eye-witnesses, return from the battle with the ears, noses, fingers and even heads of German soldiers.



Q. Let us get this right. Is it actually true that in the very midst of the fields of Europe, among the cities that represent all the treasures of civilization, among the towns that shelter the peaceful family life of the white race; wild Arabs, cruel Moors, savage Senegalese, black negroes, ferocious and heartless Hindus are being brought?

A. It is all quite true. These things are being done by France and England, which are also now the bosom friends of the Cossack and the Tartar, and the nerveless, heartless, conscienceless little yellow man of Japan.

Q. Are there any more savages who could possibly be brought into Europe to fight for freedom, civilization and democracy against the German barbarians?

A. If there are, the Allies will find them and bring them to Europe.

Q. All this augurs well for the future of European civilization and the dominance of the White Race, does it not?

A. There are some things too serious to be facetious about.

Q. What do the American people think about this use of all the savages of the four quarters of the globe to fight White Men in the White Man's home?

A. The masses of the American people can hardly be said to have done any thinking about this war as yet. They are just now beginning to sicken of the falsehoods shouted at them by the Anglo-American press, and, very soon, we hope they will begin to think.

Q. Can the use of negro and half-negro troops by France be compared with the use of American negro regiments by the United States?

A. Not at all. The negroes in the Union Army in the Civil War had been meliorated and advanced toward civilization by contact with Southern civilization at its best as well as its worst. They were uplifted from savagery, furthermore, by the inspiring knowledge that they were fighting for their own freedom; and they were under the command of calm American officers who had more sorrow than hatred in their hearts. The negro troops in the American army to-day are men long in contact with white American civilization in all its phases. But the black men in the French army are savages; knowing white civilization only thru its brutal military organization; transported to Europe as mere mercenaries and turned loose on a foe whom their white officers have been taught to hate venomously for forty years.

Q. Why do the English love the Hindus?

A. We must discriminate in our reply to that. The English do not love the mild Hindus whom they kick about and tax and sweat and kill by famine; they do not love the educated Hindus who aspire to rid their land of the English and raise their countrymen to manhood. But sixty years ago the English discovered (according to their story) that the Hindu soldier is a heartless, bloodthirsty murderer, especially apt at the slaughter of women and children. Whether this English view of Hindu traits has anything to do with the bringing of Hindu troops into white men's Europe, is left to you. You have three guesses. Of course, as the English have shown in South Africa and elsewhere, it makes a difference WHOSE women and children—!

Q. Well, it is dreadful for the Germans to have any dealings with the Turks, is it not?

A. Oh, dreadful. Of course it was different when England used to be the firm Ally of the Turks.

Q. Explain how dreadful the Turks are.

A. Well, they are white men. They have been a European power for many centuries. They are said by some, who have considered their achievements and their difficulties, to be one of the great constructive races. They are admitted by all who know them to be innately humane and kindly. They were religiously tolerant long before the Christian nations. Their civilization has run to seed, and their natural kindness and tolerance, intolerably exasperated by the intriguing and plotting of inferior peoples who happened to be Christians, has sometimes changed to a decided ferocity in punishing the troublemakers. Thereupon professional English humanitarians, seeing a chance to divert attention from Ireland, India and such places; and Balkan Committees run from the Foreign Office in Downing Street; and Macedonian Committees run from Athens; and Armenian Committees subsidized by Russia, all these have added a few thousand per cent. to the Turkish reprisals and transformed them to dreadful atrocities.

Q. Well, with whom should Americans sympathize?

A. Oh, with the Allies, of course. Dear me, yes, can you doubt it? Are we not Anglo-Saxons? The more than seventy per cent. of us, who are Germans, Irish, Austrian Slavs, and persecuted Jews from Russia, must not interfere with Anglo-Saxon unity, y'know. Didn't England do her best to preserve that unity at the bayonet's point in 1776? Didn't she do her best to restore it by holding up our ships, and stealing our sailors

till 1814? Didn't she strive for our unity by fitting out very many war vessels, financing, officering, manning and arming them, to destroy our commerce, in 1860-64? Don't the columns of her newspapers and periodicals, so full of insults toward us, show how she loves us? Then, again, must we not show that the American spirit of fair-play is equal to the English by siding with the seven nations which have jumped on the two? Must we not show our love of frankness and honesty by siding with the nations which deliberately put a ring around Germany, which plotted her overthrow merely because she was a commercial rival, which harbored insane hatred of her for forty years, and which yet pretend that Germany started the war merely because she struck without waiting for their knives to enter her vitals? Must we not side with the alliance which includes the Moor, the Arab, the Negro, the Hindu, the Cossack, the Apache and the Hooligan? Must we not prefer the civilization of Omsk and Tompsk, of Warsaw and Kishineff, of the knout and the pogrom and the hopelessly corrupt and enslaving Russian church—must we not prefer these to the civilization of Nuremberg and Munich, Dresden, Berlin, Bayreuth, Oberammergau, Vienna, Buda-Pesth and Prague—Bremen and Hamburg—Bonn and Heidelberg—Goethe and Schiller, Wagner and Strauss, and a thousand scholars and leaders of thought; the civilization of industry, peace and intelligence? Oh, surely, we Americans must prefer hatred and jealousy and deception to simple honesty and straightforwardness; we must prefer the Hooligan and the Apache, the dupe of the English manufacturer and the insanely revengeful dupe of Delcasse, to the industrious, sober-minded German; we must prefer the mongrel hordes of niggers and half-niggers, Hindus and Tartars, to the pure stock of the white race, the civilizing Teuton; we must prefer the cowards who band together in overwhelming numbers before they dare attack their victims; we must prefer the squealers who began to whimper and call the Germans names the minute the Germans began to whip them; we must prefer the liars who din our ears with absurd stories which reliable Americans on the ground promptly deny. Oh yes, these must be our preference.

The newspapers tell us so.

But Have the Newspapers Read

Our Hearts, Our Minds,

Our Consciences,

Correctly?



## THE BRITISH BRAND OF CIVILIZATION



*Jugend*

Me name is Tommy Atkins,  
I'm a bloomin' clever chap,  
For me comrade is a Cossack  
An' me partner is a Jap;

I'm friends with 'airy Gurkas  
An' bloody 'eathen Sikhs,  
With black Algerian Turcos  
An' other colored freaks;

An' with all the bloomin' virtues  
For which you know we shine,  
We're carryin' CIVILIZATION  
To the people on the Rhine.

LIBRARY



0 021

Hollinger  
pH



525

7